

Wage and Hour Division, Labor

§ 780.11

with the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 are continued in effect; all other opinions, rulings, interpretations, and enforcement policies on the subjects discussed in the interpretations in this part are rescinded and withdrawn. The interpretations in this part provide statements of general principles applicable to the subjects discussed and illustrations of the application of these principles to situations that frequently arise. They do not and cannot refer specifically to every problem which may be met in the consideration of the exemptions discussed. The omission to discuss a particular problem in this part or in interpretations supplementing it should not be taken to indicate the adoption of any position by the Secretary of Labor or the Administrator with respect to such problem or to constitute an administrative interpretation or practice or enforcement policy. Questions on matters not fully covered by this bulletin may be addressed to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC 20210, or to any Regional Office of the Division.

§ 780.9 Related exemptions are interpreted together.

The interpretations contained in the several subparts of this part 780 consider separately a number of exemptions which affect employees who perform activities in or connected with agriculture and its products. These exemptions deal with related subject matter and varying degrees of relationships between them were the subject of consideration in Congress before their enactment. Together they constitute an expression in some detail of existing Federal policy on the lines to be drawn in the industries connected with agriculture and agricultural products between those employees to whom the pay provisions of the Act are to be applied and those whose exclusion in whole or in part from the Act's requirements has been deemed justified. The courts have indicated that these exemptions, because of their relationship to one another, should be construed together insofar as possible so that they form a consistent whole. Consideration

of the language and history of a related exemption or exemptions is helpful in ascertaining the intended scope and application of an exemption whose effect might otherwise not be clear (*Addison v. Holly Hill*, 322 U.S. 607; *Maneja v. Waialua*, 349 U.S. 254; *Bowie v. Gonzales* (C.A. 1), 117 F. 2d 11). In the interpretations of the several exemptions discussed in the various subparts of this part 780, effect has been given to these principles and each exemption has been considered in its relation to others in the group as well as to the combined effect of the group as a whole.

§ 780.10 Workweek standard in applying exemptions.

The workweek is the unit of time to be taken as the standard in determining the applicability of an exemption. An employee's workweek is a fixed and regularly recurring period of 168 hours—seven consecutive 24-hour periods. It need not coincide with the calendar week. If in any workweek an employee does only exempt work, he is exempt from the wage and hour provisions of the Act during that workweek, irrespective of the nature of his work in any other workweek or workweeks. An employee may thus be exempt in 1 workweek and not in the next. But the burden of effecting segregation between exempt and nonexempt work as between particular workweeks is upon the employer.

§ 780.11 Exempt and nonexempt work during the same workweek.

Where an employee in the same workweek performs work which is exempt under one section of the Act and also engages in work to which the Act applies but is not exempt under some other section of the Act, he is not exempt that week, and the wage and hour requirements of the Act are applicable (see *Mitchell v. Hunt*, 263 F. 2d 913; *Mitchell v. Maxfield*, 12 WH Cases 792 (S.D. Ohio), 29 Labor Cases 69, 781; *Jordan v. Stark Bros. Nurseries*, 45 F. Supp. 769; *McComb v. Puerto Rico Tobacco Marketing Co-op Ass'n*, 80 F. Supp. 953, affirmed 181 F. 2d 697; *Walling v. Peacock Corp.*, 58 F. Supp. 880-883). On the other hand, an employee who performs exempt activities during a workweek will not lose the exemption by virtue of the